

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/694,609

Applicant(s)

HOLLADAY, JACK T.

Examiner

Alicia M. Harrington

Art Unit

2873

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alicia M. Harrington.

(3) Dr. Holladay.

(2) Mr. Nauman.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 July 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 4.

Identification of prior art discussed: Server (US 6,926,408).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Dr. Holladay explained the difference between the prior art test methods in figure 1 and his method illustrated in figures 2-3. Dr Holladay aslo explained the differences between the invention of figure 4 and figure 6 of Sarver(US 6,926,408). Dr Holladay explained the fundamental difference between Sarver and his figure 4 is that Sarver's pattern is not uniform around the circumference because the intensity is variable around the circumference. The Examiner asked applicant to formalize the arguments in writing by pointing to specific text in the Sarver patent that teaches this assessment and to the recitation in the claim that defines applicant's invention over Sarver. .